

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending with this paper. Claims 1-21 stand rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-21 for the reasons as will be discussed. Applicant is also adding claim 22, which is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 18, lines 6-26.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,422 (Chiang) and International Patent Publication WO 98/44443 (RationalInvestors).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of “displaying details of the computer-implemented method and displaying the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes and further comprises: firing the at least one profile when an incorrect answer is provided by the student; and triggering a topic in a concept tree when the at least one profile fires, wherein the concept tree contains a plurality of concepts associated with the current simulation task and, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a cognitive educational experience.” The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 16, lines 30-40 and page 18, lines 6-26.

Chiang and RationalInvestors, either individually or in combination, fail to teach the above feature. Chiang merely teaches an optional monitoring function in which users are expected to perform every action in the order that the lesson specifies and prevents users from deviating from this path. (Column 15, lines 22-39.) Also, Chiang teaches determining whether a user input message matches to what is expected and merely generates an error message and discards the user input if a mismatch occurs. (Column 17, line 50-column 18, line 48.) Consequently, Chiang discusses a tutorial system without providing flexibility for presenting different topics. Moreover, RationalInvestors fails to remedy the deficiencies of Chiang.

Independent claim 10 includes the similar feature of “logic that displays details of the computer program and that displays the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes and further comprises: firing the at least one profile when an incorrect answer is provided by the student: and triggering a topic in a concept tree when the at least one profile fires, wherein the concept tree contains a plurality of concepts associated with the current simulation task and, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a cognitive educational experience.” Also, independent claim 19 includes the feature of “displaying details of the computer-implemented method and displaying the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes and further comprises: firing the at least one profile when an incorrect answer is provided by the student: and triggering a topic in a concept tree when the at least one profile fires, wherein the concept tree contains a plurality of concepts associated with the current simulation task and, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a cognitive educational experience.” Moreover, claims 2-3, 5, 7, 11-12, 14, 16, and 20-21 ultimately depend from claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Chiang and RationalInvestors in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,372,507 (Goleh).

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 10. Moreover, the deficiencies of Chiang an RationalInvestors are not remedied by Goleh, and thus claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 9, 2009

/Kenneth F. Smolik/
Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001